



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

years; and thirty had not reached it at all. Such a state of things appeared to him intolerable, and he had fully made up his mind to deal with it.

The experience of the continent was wholly opposed to the English plan. At Basel, no language except the mother-tongue was learned till ten, then Latin was begun, and French and German not till thirteen. The evidence from Germany was more pertinent, for there both systems had been tried. In the gymnasia of Hanover, before the year 1866, Greek had been begun in *tertia* (average age thirteen), whereas in Prussia it was begun in *quarta* (average age twelve). After 1866, the Hanoverian system was brought into uniformity with the Prussian, and this was continued till six years ago, when it was determined not to begin Greek till fourteen. The testimony of the professors of Hanover is, that, at eighteen, boys know just as much Greek by beginning at fourteen as by beginning at twelve.

Passing to his second proposition, Dr. Fearon maintained that other subjects were squeezed out by the premature study of Greek. In the last five years they had had boys from 135 preparatory schools. He had sent a circular to sixty-two of the more important among them, and received answers from forty-five. One of the questions he had asked, was, "Do the requirements of public schools compel you to disregard subjects to which you consider more importance ought to be paid?" To this question, twenty-one had answered 'no,' and twenty-three 'yes,' but he confessed that the question was a wicked one, and that he could hardly expect masters to pass condemnation on their own system of teaching. In this matter they must go behind the judgment of preparatory masters, and he found by experience that it was precisely in this matter that preparatory masters erred and came short. They sent to Winchester, boys admirably grounded in Latin grammar, but sadly deficient in English history and French. In the last year he had been advised to reject boys for total ignorance of French. And he found, moreover, not only that the most backward boys in Latin and Greek were the most backward in French, but also that they were comparatively more backward in French than in classics, proving that all their energy had been put into Greek and Latin. The only safe guide in this question was to look to the training of boys' minds and education generally. To judge from the experience of the teachers of lower forms, and his own experience as an examiner, the boys who were best at a mechanical knowledge of Greek grammar were those who were getting least good as to the culture of general intelligence. He was convinced, from his own observation, that the two main difficulties

of young boys arose from the multiplicity of subjects, and from the number of subjects all of the same kind. Their brains got perfectly muddled by being driven from one point to another. So far from the study of Greek suffering by the change, he believed that it would gain. Boys would come more freshly to the subject at thirteen or fourteen, with minds more matured, and able to see the points that masters were driving at, and we should rid of one absurdity our present Procrustean education.

In conclusion, he recommended: 1°, That the study of Greek should not begin before the age of thirteen or fourteen, and that it should not be introduced at all in the entrance examinations of public schools. This step he intended to carry out himself. 2°, That Greek should be rigidly excluded from examinations for entrance scholarships. Latin and English would afford a much sounder test, and it would be a great advantage to have from the first the teaching of Greek in their own hand. 3°, He would give up Greek with boys who showed no taste for Greek, or who intended to leave school at seventeen. He knew that this declaration would lose him votes, but he could not himself continue the system which allowed boys to be studying Greek delectus for ten years. They could not dictate to preparatory schools, but these would follow if the head masters gave them a lead. By thus postponing and limiting the study of Greek, they would do nothing to injure the cause of Greek scholarship, and they would do much to set the education of the country on a more satisfactory basis than it was at present.

Familiar as this sort of argument is in the United States and on the continent of Europe, it is still considered ultra-radical in England; and it is somewhat surprising that Dr. Fearon's resolutions and remarks met with no greater opposition than they did. In fact, a number of head masters sided more or less strongly with Dr. Fearon. No immediate action was taken on the resolutions by the conference, however, and they were referred to a committee, after having an amendment to the effect, that, "it is desirable to arrive at some greater agreement as to the stage in education which should be reached before Greek is begun by boys intended for a classical school," tacked on to them.

THE GREEK ELEMENT IN ENGLISH.

THE crusade against the study of Greek, which is the fashion just now, is not always successfully met by the defenders of that study, because they either understate their own position or else miss altogether the true point of the discussion. The

study of Greek is not going to retain its place because some celebrated mediæval and modern intellects were trained in it. It must rest its claim upon the higher ground of its humanizing influence and its unexcelled literary culture. Greek also appeals to us as having no inconsiderable share in the formation of our own language as we know and use it to-day, especially in the nomenclature and terminology of philosophy and the sciences. The value of the study on this ground is not referred to often enough, and we have never seen it more simply and deftly emphasized than in Dr. Goodell's little book entitled 'The Greek in English.'¹ As the author puts it in his preface, "The object of this book is to enable pupils to gain some real and living knowledge of that part of English which came from Greek. . . . It merely attempts to teach that minimum which even those who wish to banish the study of Greek from our schools would admit can least easily be spared; and it is written in the belief that that portion is absolutely essential to a ready command of a full English vocabulary." And this is the kernel of the book. It is written to help students to an understanding of English, in so far as English is derived mediately or immediately from Greek.

The work is arranged about a grammatical outline somewhat like that usually found in Greek primers of the old-fashioned sort, because the author believes that to be the simplest and quickest way of learning what he has to teach. The vocabulary is rather representative than complete, but it is reasonably full. We are quite ready to believe that Dr. Goodell's book will commend itself to many preparatory teachers as giving, not all that the beginner who has a college course in view wants to know, but that minimum of Greek that is a necessary part of the equipment of every well-educated man.

Dr. Goodell makes a curious slip — unless, indeed, he holds the not impossible but improbable opinion advanced by Clement of Alexandria, that 'metaphysics' is equivalent to supranatural — when he instances 'metaphysics' as one of the words into which a deeper insight is given us by a knowledge of Greek; for the prevailing opinion is that the word 'metaphysics' is a conglomerate used by Andronicus of Rhodes to denote that portion of Aristotle's writings which came after the treatise on physics in his arrangement (*τὰ μετὰ τὰ φυσικά*). Therefore the fact that metaphysics means ontology, the science of being, is purely accidental; it might just as well have come to mean ethics or psychology; and a knowledge of Greek, while it ex-

plains the genesis of the word, can hardly be said to give us a 'lively sense of its exact meaning.'

ROSENKRANZ'S PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION.

THE influence of Professor Rosenkranz on the educational thought of Germany has been very great. Born early in the century, he was a university student at a period of great philosophical and pedagogical activity. Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and Schleiermacher were then the great leaders of German thought, and Rosenkranz came under the personal influence of the two latter. While yet a very young man, — he was twenty-eight years of age at the time, — he entered upon his long tenure of the chair of philosophy at Königsberg in succession to Kant and Herbart. The work of which the book before us is a translation was published in 1848, under the title '*Pædagogik als system*.' It may be said to have raised pedagogical discussion in Germany from the petty details of kindergarten and administration to the high plane of philosophy. The work has also had a wide circulation, considering its character, in this country, for it was originally translated, some fifteen years ago, for the *Journal of speculative philosophy*, and, in addition to its circulation in that form, two thousand copies of a reprint failed to meet the demand for it. For the present and second edition, which Dr. William T. Harris publishes as the first volume in the International education series, edited by him, the translation has been revised and popularized, and accompanied with a full commentary and analysis, prepared by Dr. Harris himself. These latter are so elaborate that they unquestionably veil to a certain extent Rosenkranz's own work, but just as unquestionably do they add to the value of the book for teachers.

The translation of the title by 'philosophy of education' is a happy one, for it sets the book before American readers in its true light. It tells them in a word that there is a science of education, and that that science claims a place in the philosophical encyclopædia in the closest connection with psychology and ethics. For pedagogics may be best described as psychology and ethics applied. The title indicates, also, the stand-point and method of the book, for, as Dr. Harris says in his preface, to earn this title, "a work must not only be systematic, but it must bring all its details to the test of the highest principle of philosophy."

It must be premised that Rosenkranz's philosophy, and hence this theory of education, is

¹ *The Greek in English*. By THOMAS D. GOODELL, Ph.D. New York, Holt. 16°.

The philosophy of education. By JOHANN KARL FRIEDRICH ROSENKRANZ. Translated by ANNA C. BRACKETT. New York, Appleton. 12°.